

## REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed June 6, 2001. A Petition to Revive Unintentionally Abandoned Application is being filed with the present Response.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Objection of Drawings

Fig. 5 has been amended to include a legend of --Prior Art--.

The cover 8 is shown in Figs. 1, 2B and 2D and the bottom 9 is shown in Figs. 1, 2C, 2D, 3D and 4D.

No new matter is added.

2. Rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-4 have been amended to correct the informalities as indicated by the Examiner.

In claim 1, there has been added the description "the ferrite core formed of one piece" which is supported by the drawings, especially Figure 1, and has been more clearly described based on at least Fig. 1 in the amended specification (see, the amended paragraph beginning at page 5, line 18). No new matter is added.

Further, the core is formed to have a substantial cubic-shape by the cover, the bottom, the front wall, the rear wall and the side walls. The bobbin is exposed upwardly to the outside through the opened region provided by the cover having a substantial H-shape. The bobbin extends vertically between the cover and the bottom across the pair of through holes. The electrode extends from the bottom the cover at corners defined with the front wall, the rear wall and the side walls, respectively.

In claim 2, a sealant is charged in the though holes and the opened region of the H-shaped cover and received and maintained on the rectangular bottom to make the ferrite core have a complete cubic-shape.

“Said windings” in claims 3 and 4 are anteceded by “windings” in claim 1, and claim 3 has an additional feature that the windings are electrically connected to the electrodes, respectively, by thermo-compression bonding which is a method for bonding the windings to the electrodes well known in the art.

3. Rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsui et al. [U.S. Patent No. 4,352,080] in view of Tsunemi [U.S. patent No. 6,157,283]

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that Mitsui et al. and Tsunemi fail to disclose or suggest the following positively recited features:

- a. in which the ferrite core is formed of one piece, as defined in claim 1 (and supported by the amended paragraph beginning at page 5, line 18 of the specification and the drawings); and
- b. in which the bobbin is exposed upwardly to the outside through the opened region provided by the cover having a substantial H-shape, as defined in claim 1 (and supported by the amended paragraph beginning at page 5, line 18 of the specification and the drawings).

Specifically, Mitsui et al. merely disclose bottom and cover portions, each having sidewalls defining an opened region and a bobbin extending in parallel with the sidewalls, but do not disclose or teach the above technical features of the present invention that the ferrite core is formed of one piece and the bobbin is exposed upwardly to the outside through the upwardly opened region provided by the H-shaped cover. Accordingly, the invention of Mitsui et al. cannot be expected to exhibit effects of the present invention, i.e., easy removal of the burr around the bobbin, easy winding of the pair of windings, easy division of ends of the pair of windings, the easy connection between the ends of the windings and the electrodes and the automation of the above operations.

It is respectfully submitted that Examiner's hindsight combination of Mitsui et al. and Tsunemi is believed entirely improper in the absence of any suggestion, teaching or motivation given in any of the prior art references to do so, and inasmuch as one skilled in the art would have no reason to make such combination.

Furthermore, even assuming, arguendo, that such combination were proper, such combination still cannot render the present invention obvious because neither Mitsui et al. nor Tsunemi discloses or even implies the present invention. Accordingly, even if every single disclosure contained in each of the references is selectively chosen and stacked together against the present invention, such combination cannot possibly suggest to an ordinary person skilled in the art the inventive features of the present invention.

Applicants have also carefully reviewed the cited but not relied upon references and believe that they are deficient in their ability to anticipate or render obvious the present invention as defined by the pending claims.

As stated above, the prior art references do not show the inventive features of the present invention as set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 defines patentable inventions over the prior art references and, therefore, are allowable.


It is also believed that the remaining claims, which directly or indirectly depend on claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons indicated with respect to claim 1 and further because of the additional features recited therein which, when taken alone and/or in combination with the features recited in claim 1, remove the invention defined therein further from the disclosures made in the cited reference.

Applicants believe that this is a full and complete response to the Office Action. For the reasons discussed above, applicants now respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in complete condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 1 to 4 be

allowed in their present form. If the Examiner feels that any issues that remain require discussion, he is kindly invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

Any fee due with this paper, including any extension fees, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Hassan A. Shakir  
Reg. No. 53,922  
(212) 940.6489

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**  
Docket No.: 3002/FLK (032878-87674)